



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—THE AGON OF THE OLD COMEDY.

An ancient Greek tragedy may be compared to a discourse the object of which is to inculcate some moral or to explain and illustrate some divine law—such a discourse, for instance, as a sermon based upon a “text.” A comedy of the old period, on the other hand, is like a debate on a more or less definitely formulated question. This question may be a practical one of a moral or political nature, or it may be merely ideal or purely fanciful. In comedies of the former kind there is a contest, earnest and serious, sometimes bitter, between two opposing principles; in those of the latter class the contest is only an outward form, owing its existence to custom.¹ It is not possible to draw the line sharply between the two kinds of comedy; but the *Knights* and the *Clouds* are separated by a wide gulf from the *Birds* and *Ekklesiazousai*.

There is another basis of classification that will be useful in the present discussion, and that is, the result of the contest. Just as in the tragedy (to use the word in its ordinary loose sense) the characters with whom we sympathize may succumb, as in the *Antigone* of Sophokles, or may triumph, as in his *Elektra*, so in comedy the good principle or the true doctrine may triumph, as in the *Wasps*, or it may succumb, as in the *Clouds*. In the latter case the dénouement always shows us that it is the unjust cause that has prevailed. The closing scene of the *Clouds* and the various warnings of the Choros are comparable to the utter desolation of Kreon and the ominous voice of Teiresias, while, so far as the play is concerned, the *δίκαιος λόγος* is as hopelessly undone as *Antigone*.

In the old comedy not only is each play a general contest, but at a certain point the representatives of the two opposing principles are brought face to face and have a regular debate under fixed rules and in prescribed form. This special contest forms the central part of the play, around which all else is grouped. What

¹ With the further development, leading to the new comedy, which had amusement for its object, and consequently gave up even the form of a contest, and with the causes that brought about this revolution, we are not here concerned.

precedes it is introductory to it; what follows flows from it. If we compare the whole play to a war, the scene under discussion is the decisive pitched battle. Before the battle there is organizing, manoeuvring, skirmishing; after the battle pursuing, capturing, negotiating; but during the all-important crisis of conflict everything else awaits the issue in breathless suspense. Sometimes, however, a great battle does not decide a war. This too finds its analogy in comedies. The conflict in the *Frogs* is called a *πόλεμος* (v. 1099), but at the end of the special contest the battle is pronounced indecisive and the continuation of hostilities is proclaimed. In the *Knights* there is a second conflict between the same antagonists (303 ff., 756 ff.). These features of the plays mentioned will be found to affect the form of the contests proper.

This scene, so characteristic of the old comedy, of course could not escape notice. Westphal (*Metrik der Griechen*, II, pp. 401 ff., 494) gives a clear statement of the form and nature of at least the chief portion of the contest, calling it a *Syntagma* (with *Antisyntagma*); but he treats it merely as an important passage of the *epeisodia*, without according to it the importance of a distinct subdivision of the play, quite co-ordinate with the *Parodos* and the *Parabasis*, though in his *Prolegomena zu Aeschylus Tragödien* (p. 97) he speaks of the typical form of the *Parabasis* and the *Antisyntagmatic* parts of the old comedy. Neseemann, in his *De Episodii Aristophaneis*, 1872 (p. 43), calls it *comoediae nobilissimam partem eiusque robur*, and (p. 51) *totius comoediae partis scenicae umbilicum*, considers it a special form of the *epeisodion*, and devotes no less than eighteen pages out of his sixty-two to the *certatio*; whereas Arnoldt gives no further development to the subject, but even totally ignores it in his *Chorpartien bei Aristophanes*, although he bases part of his work upon that of Neseemann. Some of the editors, such as Kock and Teuffel, deem it sufficient to refer to Westphal's *Metrik*. The ancient scholiasts, as will be seen, were not entirely ignorant of the peculiar form of the contest.¹

Such was the state of the subject when the writer, being engaged in the revision of Kock's *Clouds*, felt the inadequacy of the

¹ Zacher, in an elaborate review of Zieliński (*Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie*, 1886, Coll. 1546-1553, 1610-1615), cites also Bräuning, *Ueber Aristophanes Frieden*, Halle, 1874, S. 23 foll., and maintains, in the usual generous German way, that Zieliński has done nothing more than to set up a nomenclature for the whole and the parts.—B. L. G.

existing treatment, so far as it had come to his knowledge, and commenced the preparation of an article. The plan contemplated a careful study of Aristophanes and the fragments of all the comic poets, with a view to ascertaining the origin and tracing the history of the Agon—for it was at once decided to substitute this name for the “Syntagma” of Westphal. Names for the different parts of the Agon were adopted after correspondence and conference with scholars, and all the material was collected and prepared, except on one branch of the subject. It was discovered, namely, that three plays of Aristophanes, *Acharnians*, *Peace*, and *Thesmophoriazousai*, are entirely or virtually without an Agon, though all the other plays seemed to show that an Agon was an essential part of a comedy. While the causes of this anomaly were being sought and investigated, and in two of the three cases an explanation was well-nigh despaired of,¹ a new work appeared, *Die Gliederung der Altattischen Komoedie*, von Dr. Th. Zieliński—one of the most important works, in my opinion, that the form of the Greek drama has ever called forth. It treats not only of the analysis of the old comedy, but also of the manner of the whole performance of plays, and the relation of comedy to tragedy in respect to form. A review of the entire work will appear hereafter; this article precedes it because a full discussion of the Agon is necessary to a full appreciation of his theory. His work opens with an elaborate discussion of this subject, and he too uses the name “Agon.” The greater part of what I had prepared to say was found fully presented in this work, and that too from a more comprehensive point of view. In this article no attempt will be made to distinguish what is due to it. That is a matter of no interest to the reader, and I can only request him not to ascribe to Zieliński any errors that he may detect.

To obtain the clearest possible conception of the form and

¹ Neseemann had already attacked this subject. Of the *Peace* he says (p. 52): *Altercatio quidem iis inest nulla* (*Trygaeus enim nil facit nisi stupide interrogare [sic]*): *attamen quae fatur ibi Mercurius ab iis sententiis, quas in dictis certationibus solemus invenire, non sunt aliena*. Of the *Thesmophoriazusae* he says vaguely (p. 53): *Causa cur sententiarum generalium contentio omnino desit, ex singulari fabulae conformatione videtur repetenda*. Of the *Acharnians* (p. 53): *Etiam in Acharnensibus dicta certatio frustra quaeritur. Sed compensatur aliquatenus longa oratione (496–556) qua Dicaeopolis ad audientes versus omnes iis acerrime exprobrat perversitates, quibus rempublicam iam satis superque labefactatam in tot tantasque calamitates detruserint*. —B. L. G.

nature of the Agon would require a survey of all the plays in which it occurs, with attention specially directed to that feature. In the present article, however, only one play will be examined beyond the limits of the Agon, and merely an analysis of the Agon itself of other plays will be given, details being discussed only when they are of special interest.

For the general survey the most suitable comedy is the Wasps. The question discussed in this play relates to the advantages and disadvantages of litigation. It is a satire upon the litigiousness of the Athenians; but there is so little hope of practical results that in some respects the play inclines to the farcical.

Prologos, 1-229. Philokleon and Bdelykleon, whose names sufficiently characterize them, are father and son. The opening scene takes place before day at the house of Philokleon, who has been imprisoned at home by his son because he is afflicted with a mania: he is an extreme *φιληλιαστής*. He makes several vain attempts to elude the slaves that have been placed to guard him.

Parodos, 230-525. Philokleon's *συνδικασταί* have been summoned by Kleon to be on hand at an early hour provided with a three days' supply of wrath, for the purpose of prosecuting Laches, who has been discovered to possess some money. On their way they arrive, twenty-four in number, in front of the house of Philokleon. Here the boys who carry the lamps take advantage of a mud-puddle and give some trouble. The Choros of dicasts, thus brought to a halt, sings a song, calling upon Philokleon to appear, and making various conjectures as to the cause of his unwonted remissness in failing to appear promptly. At last he is seen on top of the house, and attempts to let himself down with a rope. When in mid-air he is discovered, and a violent scene ensues. Bdelykleon and the two guards interrupt the proceeding. The dicasts dispatch the lamp-carriers to Kleon with news of the treason, and make a furious assault upon their opponents; that is, the Choreutai attempt to scale the Logeion. Other slaves are called to the rescue and the assailants are driven back, bemoaning the ills of declining years. All parties come to parley. Bdelykleon repels with ridicule the charge of treason and attempted tyranny, and claims that he is only trying to make his father lead an honorable life free from all *ὀρθροφοιτοσυκοφαντοδικοταλαιπώρων τρόπων*, and proposes to show that the life that Philokleon has been leading is one of degradation and virtual slavery. At this the old man is indignant and maintains that he is virtually a supreme

ruler, and proposes to argue the case and leave it to the Choreutai. To this proposition, strange as it may seem, Bdelykleon readily agrees, and the way is prepared for the Agon. If the reader will examine the play itself he will see that the details of this scene and of the opening of the next are as formal and imply something as familiar as the preparations for a sacrifice or any other ceremony with which the people were familiar. This latter part of the Parodos is an introduction to the Agon. Such introductions sometimes form a separate scene, a *Proagon*, as Zieliński calls it. If we adhere to the simile of war, it may be called the ἀκροβολισμός.

Before proceeding further it is necessary to fix the nomenclature. That of Zieliński is radical, being conformed to his theory of the original "epirrhematic" composition of a comedy as compared with the "episodic" of a tragedy. While I accept nearly all of his conclusions, it must be confessed that some of the names, being transferred from the Parabasis (for which they were invented, probably by scholiasts), do not seem quite appropriate. In any case it would be premature to use his terminology before his justification of it can be presented. I therefore use one of the systems I had devised before his book appeared. Following an example set more than once by Aristophanes himself, I shall provisionally, and for the practical purposes of this article, adhere to the simile of a battle, without the slightest intention of giving a permanent name to any part of the Agon. The names I use, as will be seen, relate to the substance, and not the form, except in those places for which names are already current.

Ἄγων ¹	μάχη (Szyggy)	{ ἐπιχείρησις (= "Syntagma")	{ παρακέλεις	{ ῥῶδή
			{ προσβολή	{ κέλειςμα
	ἀπ' αὐτῆς	{ ἀντεπιχείρησις (= "Antisyntagma")	{ ἀντιπαρακέλεις	{ ἐπίθεσις
			{ ἀντιπροσβολή	{ ἐπίστασις
	ἀπ' αὐτῆς	{ κρίσις		{ ἀντῳδή
		{ διάλυσις		{ ἀντικέλειςμα
				{ ἀντεπίθεσις
				{ ἀντεπίστασις

¹ The words are transcribed in what follows. Of course only those belonging to the ultimate group, *ode*, *keleusma*, *epithesis*, etc., are used often. In these and all other *theatrical* terms the Greek form is retained. For the use of the word ἄγων in reference to the formal contest, cf. Vesp. 533; Ran. 785, 867, 873, 884; Nub. 956. It is not used technically, however. The ῥῶδή might be called the παραίσεις, to complete the analogy.

The *prosbole* and *antiprosbole* are always composed of a tetrametric *epithesis* and hypermetric *epistasis*, the rhythm being anapaestic in both *prosbole* and *antiprosbole*, or anapaestic in the former and iambic in the latter, or vice versa, or iambic in both. Finally, the Agons of the later plays had no *antepicheiresis* ("Antisyntagma" of Westphal) at all. The classification of Agons will be based on these differences.

I. The *prosbole* and *antiprosbole* are both anapaestic.

1. The WASPS. *Agon*, 526-727.

(a) *Ode*, 526-545. The Choros (first Hemichorion), warning Bdelykleon of the serious nature of the contest (*ὁρᾶς γὰρ ὡς σοὶ μέγας ἐστὶν ἀγὼν*), exhorts him to use new and original arguments. The *ode* is several times interrupted by mesodic iambic tetrameters: the metre of the Parodos, but used nowhere else in the *Agon*.

(b) *Keleusma*, 546-7. The Choros (i. e. Koryphaios as leader of first Hemichorion) bids Philokleon open the contest. Here, as always, the *keleusma* consists of two tetrameters, which regularly begin with *ἀλλὰ* (nearly always *ἀλλ'*) and prescribe the metre for the *epithesis*.

(c) *Epithesis*, 548-618. Philokleon begins. The opening words, *καὶ μὲν*, though not so universally employed as the *ἀλλὰ* of the *keleusma*, are still very common. The old philheliast sets forth the power and glory of a dicast. Bdelykleon does not interrupt him much, but merely takes notes.

(d) *Epistasis*, 619-630. Here, as always, the *epistasis* is a hypermetron in the rhythm of the *epithesis*. A pause in the conflict is reached, and the assailant dresses his lines and secures his position.

(aa) *Antode*, 631-648. With the exception of a long-since recognized lacuna of two iambs (647), this corresponds metrically with the *ode*. There are also corresponding mesodic tetrameters. Perfect symmetry in the distribution of these will be attained if we give 643 to Bdelykleon. The Choros (second Hemichorion) is ecstatic at the brilliant effort of their favorite. They feel as if they were sitting on a case in the Islands of the Blessed. Addressing themselves to Bdelykleon, they tell him he has a hard job on hand.

(bb) *Antikeleusma*, 649-650. This is regularly less formal than the *keleusma*. In the present instance its form is exceptionally

indirect; still it is a summons to begin, with a warning to be prepared for failure.

(cc) *Antepithesis*, 650-718. This contains 69 verses against 71 in the *epithesis*. There is no evidence of corruption. The metrical correspondence, therefore, is not exact; whether there is any at all will be discussed at another time. The opening is not formal. Bdelykleon assumes the offensive. He portrays the slavery that Philokleon is imposing upon himself. The latter at first interrupts him with occasional objections, but finally is overcome, and prostrated, mentally and physically, by the overwhelming arguments.

(dd) *Antepistasis*, 719-724. There is no metrical correspondence with the *epistasis*. Bdelykleon, in the full consciousness of victory, relents and reviews the situation.

(e) *Krisis*, 725-8. The decision is a mere form, for Philokleon has already succumbed; but it reveals the fact that the Choros also is converted. The *krisis*, uttered by or for the *entire* Choros, consists regularly, as here, of four verses in the metre of the *antepithesis*. In the present case its last verse is connected grammatically with the first sentence of the next scene.

(f) *Dialysis*. This Agon has no formal *dialysis*; but, for the sake of completing the analysis, it may be stated that this part ordinarily consists of two triads of iambic trimeters (one triad uttered by each antagonist) in which the new situation growing out of the Agon is defined. It is not necessarily a peace, or even a truce, but it ends present hostilities. In this play it is expanded into an independent scene; hence the close grammatical nexus mentioned above.

The remaining Agons will be presented in more concise and less formal analyses.

2. THE BIRDS. *Agon*, 451-628.

This is one of the farcical comedies in which the Agon is a contest only in form. Two men, with cooking utensils and other equipments, migrate to Birdland, and after an interview with the Epops¹ or hoopoe (who has retained speech along with other reminiscences of his previous human state, and has taught the other birds the use of language), propose a plan for the amelioration

¹ Zieliński uniformly calls the *ἐποψ* the "Kuckuck." This is probably due to Droysen's example, for the names *ἐποψ* and *κόκκυξ*, *upupa* and *cuculus*, Huppup (Wiedehopf) and Kuckuck, hoopoe and cuckoo, appear to designate the same pair of different birds.

of the condition of the birds. The Epops fully endorses the proposed plan of founding a city in mid-air, and like a true Hellenic βασιλεύς, he calls an assembly of the birds to hear the proposed measure. Having obeyed the call, they for a time repudiate the authority of their master the Epops, and prepare to destroy the intruders. Matters have come to a crisis, when the Epops succeeds in restraining the infuriated Choros of birds and induces them to hear the men, "because one may learn prudence even from enemies" (v. 375). Actual hostility has exhausted itself in the ἀκροβολισμός; the Agon is quite peaceable. But there are antagonists, at least in form: the men, and the birds of the Choros. This antagonism is purposely indicated by the scene just enacted. But there can be only one antagonist on a side. Peithetairos accordingly represents the men. Who now is to represent the birds? Not the Koryphaios, for he, as a member of the Choros, has to sit in judgment on the contest; for the Choros *as such* has this function to discharge, no matter what is its relation otherwise to the action of the play. Moreover, the Koryphaios, in his capacity as leader of the first Hemichorion, must give the command to begin—the *keleusma*. Only the Epops remains. Though himself convinced, he becomes an advocate, as it were, of the other birds. In speaking of them he says "we" or "they" as happens to suit. Hence those verses in the *epitheses* that are sometimes ascribed to the Choros belong to the Epops. Other grounds of a technical nature are adduced by Zieliński for excluding the Choros from the *prosbolai*; but here they would be premature, and as they are themselves to be established by induction, we must avoid getting into a circle. But what becomes of Euelpides? He stands by and plays clown or jester. It will be found that this character—whom Zieliński calls the βωμολόχος—often takes part in the *prosbolai* (i. e. the *prosbolē* and *anti-prosbolē*).

After due preparation the Choros sings the *ode* (451-459) and gives the *keleusma* (ἀλλ' ἐφ' ὅτ' ὀφπερ κτέ. v. 460) to Peithetairos, who begins the *epithesis* (καὶ μὴν ὀργῶ κτέ. v. 462). The obstacle to be overcome is the incredulity of the birds. If this is accomplished the more violent hostilities are averted. This result is brilliantly achieved. It is demonstrated beyond the possibility of cavil or doubt that the birds are the primeval and everlasting gods, and they are utterly without excuse if they do not regain the supreme power that has been lost through the degeneracy of recent times. In the *epistasis* (523 ff.) their present fallen estate is portrayed in

vivid colors. In the *antode* (539 ff.) the birds give expression to extreme mortification and grief and place themselves entirely at the disposal of Peithetairos. The *antikeleusma* (ἀλλ' ὅτι χρὴ κτέ. v. 548) bids him tell what is to be done. If there were a real contest on hand the *antepithesis* would have belonged to the other antagonist; but as it is, Peithetairos resumes and sets forth the plan with all its details (550 ff.). He is now fulfilling the original object of the assembly. In the *antepistasis* (611 ff.) he sums up the advantages that mortals will derive from the restoration of divine powers to the birds, especially as to the matter of temples and sacrifices. The *krisis* (627 ff.), pronounced by or for the full Choros, contains four anapaestic tetrameters, as in the Wasps; but they are separated by a chorikon which ought to introduce the scene that follows. Zieliński proposes to transpose the last pair, so that all four tetrameters will precede the chorikon.

3. LYSISTRATE. *Agon*, 476-613.

The women, led by Lysistrate, have seized the Acropolis. The main body of these form the Choros of women, but Lysistrate does not act as Koryphaios or leader of Hemichorion, for she is not one of the Choreutai. The men organize and, as Choros of old men, approach with hostile intent, but are worsted in the encounter that ensues. One of the probouloi appears on the scene and calls the police to his assistance; but the women again prove too strong. By an exchange of words between the two Choroi in some pro-odic tetrameters the way is prepared for the *Agon*, the antagonists being the Proboulos and Lysistrate.

The Choros of men sing the *ode* and give the *keleusma* (ἀλλ' ἀνέρωτα κτέ. v. 484) to the Proboulos, directing him not to yield, but to bring to bear every *ἐλεγχος*. In the *epithesis* (καὶ μὴν αὐτῶν κτέ. v. 486) he inquires into the object that induced the women to seize the Acropolis. Although he has the floor, of course Lysistrate does nearly all of the talking, whilst one of the women plays *βαρμολόχος*. At the end of the *epithesis* Lysistrate commands her antagonist to keep silent, and he indignantly asks if he is to keep silent for any one with a hood on; whereupon she says if that is the obstacle she can help him, and proceeds to do so in the *epistasis* by veiling his head and furnishing other aids to silence. The Choros of women then sing the *antode*, and in the *antikeleusma* (ἀλλ' ὃ τηθῶν κτέ. v. 549) summons Lysistrate to begin the *antepithesis*. She proceeds to tell how they are going to benefit the state. The Proboulos raises occasional objections

only to have them promptly dissipated. In the *antepistasis*, as his objections begin to multiply, she cuts matters short by urging him to die and offering to aid in the preparations for his burial. The *antepistasis* contains two systems, but this is evidently due to a corruption.¹

Of course, an actual decision of the contest is out of the question. An agreement between the two Choroi is impossible. Hence there is no *krisis*, but the *apallage* is represented by a *dialysis*, the first we have met. It has the normal form, the Proboûlos uttering the first triad, 608-610, and Lysistrate the second, 611-613. Though it is no real truce it has the effect of a suspension of hostilities to bury the dead, the one who utters the first triad being the party requesting the suspension. There is a striking parallelism between the two tristichs.

II. The *prosbolē* is anapaestic and the *antiprosbolē* iambic.

4. The KNIGHTS. *Agon*, 756-940.

In this play contentions abound. There are two formal Agons, the present one being the more serious and important, though it comes after the other one. The main Agon, like all parts of the play, presents some peculiarities which are of special interest, as this is one of the earliest plays of the poet. It would be rash to say whether these peculiarities result from the poet's inexperience, or the more methodical treatment in the later plays is the result of progress in the art, due to Aristophanes along with others. Possibly both influences enter as factors, and it may be that neither does. The peculiarities of the Agons, at any rate, seem to result from the fact that the Choros virtually plays the part of an *ἀγωνιστής* almost throughout the play, and the entire play is intended to be one continuous conflict. The Agons seem to be introduced merely because formal contests were customary, and with so much controversy it was not practicable to come through with only one;

¹ Ἦννῃ β' makes a fourth actor present on the stage, introduced only here and that for the purpose of doing something that has just been done by another; for 604, καὶ τουτονὶ λαβὲ τὸν στέφανον, repeats 602, λαβὲ ταυτὶ καὶ στεφάνωσαι. Zieliński's opinion is that τὸν στέφανον, added as a gloss to τουτονί, led to the corruption, the original reading having been λαβὲ τουτονί καὶ στεφάνωσαι. Thus Ἦννῃ β' vanishes with her superfluous kolon, and the *antepistasis* becomes perfectly symmetrical with the *epistasis*; though this latter is not necessary. A different explanation had occurred to me, but I believe now that his is more probable. At any rate, whatever be its cause, no one can at all doubt the existence of the corruption, or reasonably doubt that it caused the anomaly.

though it is not to be understood that two Agons in one play are anomalous, any more than two Parabases.

The sausage-dealer Agorakritos has just had a wrangle with Kleon, who, as a true demagogue, proposes that they appeal to the dear People, to Demos himself, and manages to have the contest take place in the Pnyx. The *parakeleusis*, as usual, contains two parts, the *ode* and the *keleusma*; but the former comes near being no ode at all in the technical sense of an *ὀδὴ χορική*; but it was regularly sung, and the scholiasts properly treat it as a regular choric ode. Both it and the *keleusma* (ἀλλὰ φυλάττου κτέ. v. 761) are addressed to Agorakritos. But, nevertheless, Kleon begins the *epithesis* (τῇ μὲν, not καὶ μὴν). He opens with prayer. Agorakritos follows with a parody on his supplication. Kleon now proceeds to enumerate in a vague manner his services to Demos, whilst Agorakritos pleases the latter with little attentions, and shows that Kleon's seeming services to the state were due to selfish motives, and that some of his acts, such as the obstruction of peace, were positively hurtful. Demos speaks twice, once in praise of Agorakritos for a favor received, and once in condemnation of Kleon. It is difficult to distinguish which antagonist is the assailant. The one was summoned, but the other led off, and the whole *epithesis* is rather a *συμπλοκή*. Accordingly the *epistasis* (824 ff.), which properly belongs to the attacking party, is usurped by Agorakritos, and is rather a *σύστασις*, in which the sausage-dealer lays the blows violently upon Kleon, who makes one feeble effort. In the *antode* (836 ff.) Agorakritos is again addressed, and the *antikeleusma* encourages and exhorts him to a continuation of the conflict. But Kleon again seizes the initiative, and the *antepithesis* (843 ff.) is very much like the *epithesis*. Kleon goes slightly more into particulars, and Agorakritos makes freer use of little attentions to win the favor of Demos—such as presenting him a pair of slippers, a shirt, and the like. The judge is not at all insensible to favors, and repeatedly commends their bestower, whilst he disparages the demagogue. All of his utterances, however, are in the capacity of clown rather than of judge. The *antepistasis* (911 ff.) is divided between the antagonists (for surely 919 ff. are erroneously assigned to the Choros), Agorakritos uttering the closing sentence, in which he imprecates a curse upon Kleon; and the Choros, in lieu of a *krisis*, adds its amen in the name of three gods, using prose for the purpose. There is no *dialysis*, for the simple reason that the conflict continues without interruption.

5. The CLOUDS. *Agon*, 950-1104.

After a disorderly ἀκροβολισμός, in the form of a very long anapaestic hypermetron,¹ begun by the δίκαιος λόγος and ended by the ἄδικος, the Choros in the *ode* announces the impending conflict, the ever-famous ἀγὼν μέγιστος (956). In the *keleusma* (ἀλλ' ὃ πολλοῖς κτέ. v. 959) the Dikaios Logos is exhorted to begin, which he does in the *epithesis* (λέξω τοῖνυν, not καὶ μὴν), setting forth the excellence of the good old system of training the young, whilst the Adikos Logos makes occasional adverse comments. In the *epistasis* (1009 ff.) Dikaios sums up the advantages that will result from doing as he bids, and the evils that will follow the opposite course. In the *antode*² (1024 ff.) the Choros commends him and his cause. In the closing lines of the *antode* and in the *antikeleusma* (1034 f.) the Adikos Logos is warned of the magnitude of his undertaking. He says in the *antepithesis* that he has been impatient for some time to confute his antagonist, and boasts of his ability to make wrong prevail over right. Here we have an explanation from the poet why the unjust cause is going to be successful. That such was to be the issue of the Agon the spectators would have known before this point was reached, if the play had been performed. How they would have known this will appear in the proper place. The Adikos Logos now, by a perfect masterpiece of the sophistic art, drives the Dikaios Logos so completely to the wall that he agrees in the *antepistasis* (1085 ff.) to appeal to a numerical test. The count is made, and the εὐρύπρωκτοι among the spectators are found to be vastly in the majority; whereupon the Dikaios Logos declares himself vanquished and joins the enemy. There is no *apallage*. A *krisis* could not have been more than a mere form, and a *dialysis* was out of the question. Hence the absence of this part of the Agon need not be ascribed to the incompleteness of the revision; but what we do miss is something like an acceptance of the situation on the part of Pheidippides, who, apart from the Choros, was the sole witness of the contest, and was to decide for himself which λόγος he would choose. Moreover, the play as it stands would require five actors at this point.

¹ Not the longest we have, however, if Mnesilochos, frag. 4 (Kock), is worth counting.

² Whether the metrical discrepancy between this and the *ode* results from corruption or from the incompleteness of the revision, is a question that does not concern us here. No one doubts that the poet either made them correspond or intended to. The former alternative is by all odds the more probable.

III. The *prosbolē* is iambic and the *antiprosbolē* anapaestic.

6. The FROGS. *Agon*, 895–1098.

Dionysos has gone to Hades to bring back the soul of Euripides, whom he finds, at the head of a mob of criminals, attempting by violence to wrest the tragic throne of the lower world from Aischylos. No better basis for an Agon could have been devised. The god of the theatre himself is to act as judge. He succeeds in quieting the disturbance, and exhorts the antagonists to an orderly and decent contest. He bids Aischylos *ἐλεγχ' ἐλέγχου* not in wrath but soberly, whilst Euripides declares himself ready *δάκνειν δάκνεσθαι*. So impressed is the god with the solemnity of the occasion that he institutes prayers for divine aid that he may be able to judge properly—*ἀγῶνα κρίναι τόνδε μουσικώτατα* (873)—and requires the antagonists also to pray in their own behalf. The reason assigned for the prayer is *νῦν γὰρ ἀγὼν σοφίας ὁ μέγας χωρεῖ πρὸς ἔργον ἥδη* (883 f.). After the prayers the Agon begins.

In the *ode* the Choros of Mystai expresses interest in the terrible conflict and predicts its awful character. The *keleusma* (*ἀλλ' ὡς τάχιστα κτέ.* v. 905) is addressed to both antagonists, but the metre prescribed—the iambic tetrameter—vibrates a harmonious chord in the breast of Euripides, who accordingly begins the *epithesis* (*καὶ μὲν*). He devotes the first portion to the *ἐλεγχος* of the Aeschylean drama, and the latter portion to the merits of his own works. Dionysos, though he is *κριτής*, acts also as *βωμολόχος*, in which capacity he discloses consummate ability. Aischylos makes no direct replies to the *ἐλεγχος*, but devotes his energies to the repression of his wrath. But when Euripides begins to enumerate the “improvements” that *he* has made in tragedy, Aischylos fully agrees with him—*φημί καγὼ*—and regrets only that he did not perish before he made them. In the *epistasis* (971 ff.) the assailant portrays the benefits accruing to society from his poesy (a characteristic feature of *epistases*), and Dionysos finishes the picture with some most grotesque touches. In the *antode* the Choros exhorts Aischylos to be calm, as the occasion demands his best effort; and in the *antikeleusma* (*ἀλλ' ὦ πρῶτος κτέ.*) bids him turn loose his torrent. In the *antepithesis* he turns it loose. For a time even Euripides is swept before it. Dionysos resumes his rôle of clown, but at one point (1024 f.), if the text is correct, grows rather serious for a clown, and for a judge takes a rather active part in the contest. In the *antepithesis* (1006 f.) Aischylos reverses the order adopted by his antagonist, and first presents his own

merits, then the faults of Euripides, who begins to reply to the latter portion. The *antepistasis*¹ sums up the faults and describes the evil fruits of the Euripidean poesy, and Dionysos adds another *βωμολόχενμα*. Here we should expect the *krisis*; but a new scene begins, in which the Choros declares the conflict indecisive and proclaims a continuation of the struggle. The contest continues through to the Exodos, as in the Knights, although the technical form has been exhausted. The final *κρίσις* of Dionysos is made after the actual contest is ended (1467 ff.).

IV. Both *prosbolē* and *antiprosbolē* are iambic.

The two Agons belonging to this class are secondary, each one occurring in a play that contains another more important Agon.

7. The KNIGHTS. *Agon*, 303-460.

After a violent scene in the Parodos, Agorakritos and Kleon become involved in a logomachy which the Choros turns into a formal Agon. In the *ode* (303 ff.) the Choros heaps hearty abuse upon the head of Kleon, the latter and Agorakritos interrupting the *ode* with mesodic trochaic tetrameters. Then is uttered a rather ambiguous *keleusma* (ἀλλ' ὦ τραφεῖς κτέ. v. 333); the one clear thing about it is that it is addressed to a villain. Agorakritos begins the *epithesis* (καὶ μὲν); but Kleon evidently thinks that *he* was meant, and a strange strife ensues (which will be explained in its place), Agorakritos maintaining, as he had done before, and no doubt with truth, that he too is a villain. Both antagonists, in consequence, have the floor simultaneously. As in the chief Agon of this play, the *epithesis* (335 ff.) is converted into a *συμπλοκή* and the *epistasis* into a *σίσταισις*. The entire *prosbolē* is billingsgate of the first quality. In the *antode* (382 ff.) both antagonists receive due attention. Some of the mesodic tetrameters of the *ode* have no antapodosis. This want of symmetry, as also the question of the proper assignment of 319-321, need not detain us here. The *antikeleusma* (407 f.) is the only one that does not directly or indirectly contain a summons to begin. Throughout the *antipara-keleusis*, in fact, the Choros itself seems not to know who was the assailant in the *prosbolē*, and accordingly, by giving the mere form of an *antikeleusma* without the substance, leaves both antagonists free to attack. Kleon then begins the *antepithesis* (409 ff.); but

¹ The catalectic dimeter 1088 breaks the hypermetron. Zieliński proposes ἐτι < τῶν > νυνί. I had thought of ἐστὶν νυνί. There can be no reasonable doubt that the verse is corrupt.

immediately it becomes a melee ; and the latter part of the *antepistasis* (441 ff.) is taken from the antagonists altogether. Then follows the normal *krisis* of four iambic tetrameters ; but it is a *krisis* only in form. The substance of a *dialysis* is contained in the first few lines of the scene that follows.

8. The CLOUDS. *Agon*, 1345-1451.

The *ἄδικος λόγος* has triumphed in the great Agon. Pheidippides has completed his course of instruction with marked success, and Strepsiades leads him into the house to celebrate the occasion with a feast. Presently he rushes out, pursued and beaten by his son. The lad not only admits that he has beaten his father, but offers to demonstrate that he did it justly. Strepsiades, utterly astounded and desirous to hear what in the world the young sophist can say in favor of such a doctrine, undertakes to argue the case with him ; and the Agon begins.

In the *ode* the Choros warns Strepsiades of the critical nature of the contest, and in the *keleusma* (ἀλλ' ἐξ ὅτου κτέ. v. 1351) bids him tell how the trouble began. This he does in the *epithesis* (καὶ μὲν, v. 1353), saying that he had asked his son to sing at the feast and play the cithara, and the youth had expressed contempt (which he now repeats) for such grasshopper usages. He had then requested him at any rate to recite a piece from Simonides ; but the lad pronounced Simonides a bad poet, and even when Aischylos was timidly suggested he spoke contemptuously of him. Being then given free choice he recited a shocking *ῥῆσις* from Euripides—the story of Kanache. The old man's wrath boiled over ; word led to word and finally to blows from the young man. Here the narrative ends, and Strepsiades fears to renew the quarrel which threatens to break out afresh, and in the *epistasis* (1386 ff.) contrasts the kindness he had shown Pheidippides when a child with the treatment just received in return. The Choros in the *antode* (1391 ff.) expresses gloomy forebodings as to the value of old men's skins if the new doctrine becomes established. The *antikeleusma* (1397 ff.) in appropriate words bids Pheidippides begin. He opens the *antepithesis* and in fine sophistic style proceeds to demonstrate his proposition. The father's replies are no trifles. We almost feel that the Adikos Logos and the Dikaïos Logos are before us again ; but, as before, sophistry prevails and Strepsiades confesses himself vanquished. The son then offers him a consolation : he will beat his mother too ; and in the *epistasis* (1446 ff.) he proposes to prove that it would be right. The old man, almost stupefied

with amazement, can only suggest that the youth throw himself, ἤπτων λόγος, Socrates and all, into the Barathron. There immediately follows an ordinary dialogue in iambic trimeters. Whether the poet, in completing the revision, would have added an *apallage* is not evident from the context. The transition seems to be natural and easy, and a *krisis* would be superfluous.

V. The Agon has a single *epicheiresis* instead of a *syzygy*. The *probole* is anapaestic in the two extant examples. Thesmoph. 531-573 is indeed iambic, but can hardly be counted as an Agon. Still it is probable that Agons of this class were sometimes iambic.

9. EKKLESIAZOUSAI. *Agon*, 571-709.

The great woman's rights *coup d'état* has been carried through. Blepyros, whose wife Praxagora has been missing since long before day, has learned from a passing friend the details of the proceedings at the Pnyx, but does not suspect that the women were there. The Choros of women appear before his house, where he confronts his wife in their presence. Having satisfied himself as to the cause of her absence in his clothes, he tells her the wonderful news. At first she has difficulty in realizing it, but at last says it will redound to the glory of the state. Blepyros is not so sure of that, but she says she can convince him; and the Agon begins.

In the *ode* the Choros exhorts her to have her wits about her and devise something new and astounding. The *keleusma* (ἀλλ' οὐ μέλλειν κτέ. v. 581) bids her begin promptly. In the *epithesis* (καὶ μὴν, v. 583) she explains the policy that is to be pursued, which she does so knowingly that one might suspect that the matter was not wholly new to her. There is to be no private property, no lawsuits, no trouble of any kind, but feasting, happiness, and love—all as free as air. The slaves will do the work. Blepyros raises numerous objections, but they are met and all his doubting questions fully answered. In the *epistasis* she portrays the great advantages of the new constitution in regard to the sexual relations, and adds a clause to secure equal rights to the less favored. There is no *formal krisis* or *dialysis*. The resemblance to the Agon of the Birds will be apparent to all, but it is as that of Antigone to Elektra.

10. PLOUTOS. *Agon*, 487-626.

Chremylos and Blepsidemus are making arrangements to have sight restored to the blind god of riches whom they have in their

possession. The wan goddess Penia appears, and after denouncing their intended outrage, proposes to show that it would result in calamity to the human race, and that she alone is the cause of all blessings. They do not object to hearing her, and the Agon opens.

There is no *ode*; in fact there was no real Choros, as is evident from the manner in which the scant seeming chorika of the rest of the play are treated. In the *keleusma* (ἀλλ' ἥδη κτέ. v. 487) the Koryphaios, or whatever he should be called, gives the two men a summons to begin. Chremylos, then, in the *epithesis* sets forth at length the benefits that would flow from the restoration of sight to Ploutos: he would come only to the good and worthy, whereas now many good people starve, while many unjust prosper. Penia, in her replies, makes the false assumption that riches, according to the plan, are to be distributed to all alike. This error escapes Chremylos entirely.¹ After a long debate, in which Penia by no means gets the worst of it, Chremylos, more candid than most disputants, declares in the *epistasis* οὐ γὰρ πείσεις οὐδ' ἦν πείσης (600), and the two men get rid of their troublesome antagonist by simply driving her by main force from the stage. Naturally enough there is no *krisis*; but the Agon is very appropriately and, to the spectators, no doubt amusingly terminated with a *dialysis* both triads of which are uttered by Chremylos, his friend separating the two utterances for him by means of a distich.

II. Of the three plays that are virtually without an Agon, the THESMOPHORIAZOUSAI contains a passage which in form is a mutilated *Agon*, 531-573. The *ode* preceding 531 belongs to the foregoing syzygy, so that the Agon begins with the *keleusma* (ἀλλ' οὐ γάρ ἐστι κτέ.), which has only the form of a summons. In

¹ There is no visible reason for the introduction of this inconsistency. Aristophanes must have been conscious of it, just as in the *Clouds* he knew the cock was not a quadruped. But there the error was for comic effect, while this instance affords no amusement. Some think it grew out of the revision. It is perhaps idle to discuss the question; but some who have written on it commit an error analogous to that of Penia. They say that only the good, and so only those willing to labor, were to become rich; and hence there is nothing in Penia's objection that no one will want to work because he will have money without working. But did Chremylos' notion of the χρηστοί require them to labor? Did he mean to labor himself? Far from it. When he says the slaves will do the work he uses μοχθεῖν, a very significant word. His idea of the blessings of wealth is that it will enable a man to live without μόχθοι. Still the inconsistency remains.

the *epithesis* Mnesilochos and a woman become involved in a violent *λοιδορία* which is stopped by the Choros. This passage is entirely inadequate to fulfill the requisites of an Agon if each play is entitled to one. We may ignore its existence.

The results of the study of the *Fragmenta Comicorum*, which could not be very fruitful, may be summed up in the statement that there is all the evidence that could be demanded that other writers of the old comedy made use of the Agon, and that Aristophanes used them in his lost plays.

The survey that has been given shows the Agon to have been so fixed in form and substance and so essential to the very nature of comedy, and also to have been so familiar to the Athenian public, that we may well be surprised to find that there are three plays of Aristophanes in which it does not occur. It would be in order, therefore, to look into the causes of this peculiarity of those plays; but this must be reserved for another article. Let it suffice for the present to give assurance that, while it can hardly be demonstrated for all three, still it is certain in the case of one, and highly probable in the case of the other two, that they originally contained each an Agon. And even if the proofs fail to convince some, so much is irrefragable: it would be erroneous to assume that we know of any play of the old comedy that *was certainly composed without an Agon*.

We are now prepared to take a comprehensive view of the whole field. It will be observed that in all the plays of the serious class two opposing principles rise side by side, and begin to clash more and more until it is not possible for the action to proceed further without disposing of one of them, unless indeed the whole play is to be continual strife. In the more farcical plays a principle or tendency that is sure to challenge opposition arises, and grows to the point where it must either be suppressed or allowed to have full sway, the point where it must either *πείθειν* or *πείθεσθαι*. When this place has been reached in a comedy, all action of any other sort must be suspended while the two opposing principles in the serious class settle the question of supremacy by a formal contest, and in the other class the one growing tendency or principle disarms opposition. That the action should in all cases cease during the Agon (a fact emphasized by Zieliński) seems to me to be merely a necessity growing out of the debate. A suspension of the action, in other words, is not a characteristic of the Agon; the Agon is a suspension of the action; or rather, in one sense it

is itself a part of the action. Its length, indeed, as Zieliński justly remarks, and the impossibility of other action until it is ended, are calculated to create in us admiration for the patience of an Attic audience, especially when we consider that, as a rule, soon after the Agon comes the equally long Parabasis, which has nothing to do with the action of the play. But in fact it was just these that the public went to the theatre to witness. Whether the later comedy, when Agon and Parabasis had disappeared, was not more entertaining than the old comedy, is a question that does not concern us. The old comedy had grown into what it was, and had to grow, or shrivel, into something else. No one could suddenly revolutionize it. The indications are that originally, when there were no *ἀγωνισταί*, the essential part of a comedy was a contest between the leaders of the Hemichoria, or, one might say, the two Choroï. This contest would be preceded by an introductory scene, which in the more fully developed comedy became the Parodos, including the Proagon (which is often a part of the Parodos). After the contest was over, the play proper being ended, the Choros unmasked and addressed the people. This usage of unmasking continued after the Parabasis ceased to form or to follow the close of the play. The Agon, then, as Zieliński remarks, corresponds to the *καταστροφή* of a tragedy, the *krisis* marking sharply the turning point—in the original comedy the virtual end—of the play. All that follows it is in a new field; we breathe a new air and have a clearer conception of our surroundings. The battle has been lost and won, or the question has been definitively settled, provided always the play is not intended to be one continual strife. When this is the case the Agon, as will presently be seen, is affected accordingly.

The participants in an Agon are the Choros (Hemichoria, Koryphaïos, and leader of second Hemichorion), the two antagonists, the judge, and the clown, the last two not being essential.

The relations of the Choros to the contest are not fixed. The Choros, for instance, may all be on one side and adhere to that side as in the *Knights*, or all on one side and be brought over to the other as in the *Wasps*, or equally divided and remain so as in *Lysistrata*, not to mention other situations. Particularly striking is the fact that, while there is sometimes a duly appointed judge, the Choros directs the contest and proclaims the result, even though the Choreutai were as far as possible from impartial when the contest began. What chance has Kleon of receiving justice in the

Knights? Just as much, *a priori*, as Bdelykleon had of being successful in the Wasps; and yet he succeeded brilliantly. The Choros was evidently on a higher plane than an American jury is supposed to be: it was thought possible for Choreutai to change their minds when they learned new facts and heard new arguments. Another interesting fact is reserved till we come to treat the form of the Agon.

The part taken by the Choros in the Agon was probably limited to the *odai* and *keleusmata*.¹ The *ode* was sung by the first Hemichorion, the *antode* by the second. The Koryphaios, as leader of the first Hemichorion, pronounced the *keleusma*, and the leader of the second gave the *antikeleusma*. The *krisis* was pronounced by or in the name of the whole Choros. It was also the duty of the Choros, that is the Hemichoria, alternately, to execute a dance while the *epithesis* and *antepithesis* were being recited. Cf. Lys. 541; Schol. Ran. 896, ἡ πρὸς τὰς ῥήσεις ἐπὶ ὁρχήσις.

The antagonists are naturally the most important participants. In plays of the trivial class they are hardly opponents at all; but still the negative disputant is either incredulous himself or else represents an incredulous body. The Agon then is only in form a contest. The poet makes use of it to instruct the spectators as to the nature of the new world into which they are introduced. The Birds would have been almost incomprehensible but for the instruction given by Peithetairos in the Agon. In plays of this kind, therefore, one disputant has the floor both in the *epithesis* and *antepithesis*; but the other asks questions and makes objections as much as he chooses. But in the serious moral or political plays the antagonism is earnest and often bitter. Sometimes the assailant has the *prosbolē* almost entirely to himself, the other antagonist having the *antiprosbolē*, as in the Wasps; but more commonly both parts are pretty evenly divided between the opponents. Yet even in this case one of them is distinctly the assailant

¹ Such is the view of Zieliński. Though it encounters some obstacles, the evidences in its favor are very strong. For these the reader is referred to Zieliński's work, especially pp. 117 f. and 293-312. It is to be regretted, however, that in the latter passage cited it is too strongly asserted that all iambic trimeters uttered by the Choros, i. e. Koryphaios, are "vom strengen, tragischen Bau." I am not sure what "Bau" covers here, but the expression seems too sweeping when applied to verses in which not the slightest regard is had to the well known Porsonic law bearing on caesura in the fifth foot. Otherwise, however, his observation is correct, and the conclusion he draws is not affected by this oversight.

and the other the defendant in the *prosbolē*, while in the *antiprosbolē* their attitudes are reversed. Now, when an army makes an attack (*ἐπιθεσις*) upon another and, without carrying the position, comes to a halt (*ἐπίστασις*), a counter attack results in the rout of the assailant. So in the Agon: the speaker that is aggressive or has the floor in the *epithesis* is doomed already if there is an *antepicheiresis* or "*antisyntagma*." If there is no *antepicheiresis* the assailant is successful; the battle ends with the capture of the position of the defendant. In other words, the last argument is the telling one; and the usage probably grew out of the desire of the poets to have the issue of a contest accord with the impression made on the spectators. Whatever be its origin, this feature of the Agon must have been perfectly familiar to all the Athenians, and consequently it placed the poet under some embarrassment. It might be desirable to conceal the *dénouement* as long as possible. If the poet took the liberty of reversing the usual practice he would create confusion in the minds of the public and consequent dissatisfaction. It is interesting to observe how Aristophanes overcame this difficulty, and in one case even turned it into a source of amusement. The strange dispute at the opening of the secondary Agon of the Knights has been alluded to. Agorakritos, it will be remembered, had claimed superiority to Kleon even in villany, when the latter set up claims in that line. Now, when the Agon is ready to begin, the Choros sings an *ode*, addressing Kleon and introducing Agorakritos as σοῦ μαρώτερος; then comes the remarkable *keleusma*, 333 f.:

ἀλλ' ὃ τραφεῖς ὄθενπέρ εἰσιν ἄνδρες οὔπερ εἰσί,
νῦν δείξον ὡς οὐδὲν λέγει τὸ σωφρόνως τραφῆναι.¹

Agorakritos tries to begin, but Kleon disputes the right:

ΑΛ. καὶ μὴν ἀκούσαθ' οἷός ἐστιν οὔτοσὶ πολίτης.

ΚΛ. οὐκ αὖ μ' ἑάσεις;

ΑΛ. μὰ Δί', ἐπεὶ καγὼ πονηρός εἰμι.

ΚΛ. οὐκ αὖ μ' ἑάσεις;

ΑΛ. μὰ Δία.

ΚΛ. ναὶ μὰ Δία.

ΑΛ. μὰ τὸν Ποσειδῶ,

ἀλλ' αὐτὸ περὶ τοῦ πρότερος εἰπεῖν πρῶτα διαμαχοῦμαι.

¹ The way in which the subject is announced suggests the manner in which Herakles put the question to Triballos on the surrender of the sceptre (Av. 1628): ὁ Τριβαλλός, οἰμῶζειν δοκεῖ σοι;

I shall not stop to discuss any difficulties, real or supposed, in the interpretation. It is clear enough that each is contending for the right to speak first, that is, *for the privilege of being beaten in the contest*, as it would amusingly appear to the spectators. The result of this broil, as we have already seen, was that no one, not even the Choros, could tell which was the assailant, and hence the *συμπλοκή* also in the *antepithesis*. It was simply intended that this Agon should be indecisive. The *krisis* is merely a congratulation for bravery on the field ; the battle is not yet won, or at least the war is not ended. The quasi *dialysis* shows Kleon to have been worsted, as he is first to speak. By a reference to the analysis of the chief Agon of this play the reader will see that it was analogous in many respects to the one just examined, and for the same reasons.

It has often been remarked by editors that in the contest between the *λόγοι* the metre in which each *λόγος* speaks seemed fitted to his character, the *δίκαιος* λ. leading off in vigorous anapaestic tetrameters, the *ἄδικος* λ. following up with ribald iambic tetrameters. In the *Frogs*, where the Agon is not to end in the triumph of wrong, Euripides, the doomed antagonist, opens with iambic tetrameters, while Aischylos follows with anapaests. A further examination of this subject, however, would be unfruitful.

The next participant in our list is the judge. When one is employed he is formally designated, and one might naturally expect more importance to be attached to his judicial function than is the case. In the *Frogs*, it will be remembered, the decision of Dionysos comes near the end of the play, the Choros having pronounced the Agon indecisive. In the *Clouds* Pheidippides has not a word to utter in connection with the Agon. The *δίκαιος λόγος* confesses himself defeated. The incompleteness of the revision at this point must not be left out of view, nor must it have too much shouldered upon it. In the *Knights* Demos commends Agorakritos whenever the latter bestows a bribe upon him ; but that is almost the full extent of his part in the Agon. After the Choros has pronounced the quasi *krisis* he concurs ; but this is in the opening of a new scene. His real decision, like that of Dionysos, comes later in the play, and settles the general contest that had pervaded the whole. Only the three plays enumerated have a judge at the Agon. In the two in which he speaks, the *Frogs* and the *Knights*, the part taken by the judge is rather in the capacity of clown.

The clown, or *βαμολόχος*, is not rarely introduced, though his presence is not essential. He is there, of course, for the purpose of rendering the debate amusing. Zieliński says his part was intended to keep before the minds of the spectators the fact that it was a comedy they were witnessing, and that his presence enabled the antagonists to be all the more serious. With this I do not fully agree. *Βαμολοχία* would have been a disturbing element in the *ἀγὼν μέγιστος* of the *Clouds*, just because of its serious nature. So in the *Ploutos Agon*, where the jester takes virtually no part, though the rest of the play is frivolous, the tone is recognized by Zieliński himself as being so serious that, when Chremylos undertook to jest, Penia at once reproved him (557 f.):

σκάπτειν πειρᾷ καὶ κωμῳδεῖν τοῦ σπουδάζειν ἀμελήσας.

The jester, as in actual life, is self-appointed. The judge himself, as already seen, may assume this function, or it may be a third actor, as in the *Birds*.

We now come to the form of the Agon. The introduction to the formal contest may be contained in the *Parodos*, or there may be a distinct *Proagon* or *ἀκροβολισμός*, as before observed. In the latter case the interscene is ordinarily composed in iambic trimeters. The peculiar exception in the great Agon of the *Clouds* has already received attention.

Between the *ode* and the *antode* there is as strict metrical correspondence as between the corresponding parts of the *Parabasis*, or between strophe and antistrophe in tragedy. Exceptions are evidently due to corruption and are no more common than in other instances of metrical responsion. The pro-odic and strange mesodic verses which sometimes appear are never composed in the metre of the *epithesis* or *antepithesis*, but in that of the *Parodos*. Zieliński thinks this may be due to accident, as the examples are so few. I think, however, that it may safely be stated as a rule. We should expect these tetrameters to harmonize with some neighboring part of the play, and it should always be the same part. This could not be the *epithesis*, for sometimes the *antepithesis* is in a different rhythm, so that the antimesodic verses would either have to clash with the *antepithesis* or with the mesodic verses.

The *keleusma* always consists of two anapaestic or iambic tetrameters, and authoritatively prescribes the metre of the *epithesis*. This fact was observed by the scholiasts. Cf. Schol. Av. 451 ff.:

ἐν εἰσθέσει [read ἐκθέσει] δὲ στίχοι ἀναπαιστικοὶ τετράμετροι δύο ὅμοιοι τοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς ἐξῆς εἰσθέσεως ξά. Id. 539 ff.: ἔχει δὲ καὶ ἐν ἐκθέσει τοὺς συννήσεις δύο στίχους ἀναπαιστικούς ὁμοίους τοῖς ἐξῆς ξά. Schol. Nub. 1345 ff.: ἐν ἐκθέσει δὲ στίχοι δύο λαμβικοί τετράμετροι ὅμοιοι τοῖς ἐξῆς. ἔθος γὰρ ἐστὶ προτιθέναι τῆς διπλῆς διστιχίαν μετὰ τὴν περίοδον τῆς κορωνίδος ἢ τῆς ᾠδῆς. So Schol. Eq. 755 it is called τὸ ἔθιμον. Cf. also Schol. Eq. 322 ff., Nub. 1024 ff., Ran. 992 ff.¹

The *keleusma* proper (not the *antikeleusma*) invariably begins with ἀλλά. Westphal (Met. II, p. 402, note 3) erroneously represents the elided form ἀλλ' as being universal in anapaestic *keleusmata* (Vesp. 649 is *antikeleusma*). In Eq. 761 we find ἀλλὰ φυλάττου. The usual elision was no doubt due to metrical considerations. In fact ἀλλὰ itself is the natural conjunction with which to make the transition from the *ode* to the *keleusma*, this transition being less abrupt at the end of the *antode*. Still its use may have become canonical from the very fact that it was *generally* necessary; and the same principle may apply to the elision.

The *keleusma* does not belong to the *ode*, for it is not sung by the Choros. This is shown by the fact that the *antikeleusma* may be in a different rhythm. There are technical reasons also for excluding it from the *epithesis*. As it is recited by the leader of the Hemichorion that sings the *ode*, and is in substance like the *ode*, I have, for convenience, called the two παρακείμεσις. If the system of nomenclature were devised with reference to the form instead of the substance, then what I have called the *prosbole* would include the *keleusma* alongside the other two parts (*epithesis* and *epistasis*).

The form of the *epithesis* has already been repeatedly mentioned. The question of symmetry as to the number of verses between the *epithesis* and *antepithesis* cannot be discussed here. Zieliński, in the latter part of his whole work, attempts to prove its existence,

¹ There are also general allusions to the Agon. The Schol. Ran. 900 (*ode* of Agon) says: προσδοκᾶν οὖν: ἔθος τοῖς ποιηταῖς προλέγειν ἅ εἰς τὸ ἐξῆς λέγειν μέλλουσι. This is nonsense except as limited to the *ode* of the Agon. The remark is of special interest as a testimony with regard to other comedians than Aristophanes: for he says τοῖς ποιηταῖς. Zieliński finds a reference to the judge and the antagonists in Luc. de Calumn. 6: τοιαύτη μὲν ἡ ὑπόθεσις τοῦ λόγου· τριῶν δ' ὄντων τῶν προσώπων, καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς κωμωδίαις, τοῦ διαβάλλοντος καὶ τοῦ διαβαλλομένου καὶ τοῦ πρὸς ὃν ἡ διαβολὴ γίνεται, κτέ. If this refers specially to the Agon it would imply that the *κριτής* was more common than the extant plays would indicate.

or rather to establish an analogous eurhythmym in the two parts. This effort is the least satisfactory part of his work ; but it would be unjust to state its weak points without giving his whole investigation, which cannot now be done. He does not resort to emendation, as some have been inclined to do.

Each *epithesis* is composed in one continuous metre. The familiar exception, Nub. 1415, κλάουσι παῖδες, πατέρα δ' οὐ κλάειν δοκεῖς, is justified by the parody. Still, of course, it has been abundantly emended. In Nub. 1085 ff. there are four iambic trimeters, seeming to form a link between the *antepithesis* and the *antepistasis*. Zieliński simply breaks them up into six dimeters, reading ποτ' ἄν for ποτέ (1086). The schol. had the trimeters in his text ; and I must confess that I should have preferred to find the change into dimeters accomplished without dividing words between kola, however common this may be elsewhere in iambic hypermetra. But in spite of all this it is difficult to believe that the poet inserted those trimeters between a tetrametric passage and its ἔκθεσις.

The *epithesis* may, without grammatical pause, pass into its *epistasis*. It is a case of στήναι τρέχοντα.

The *epistasis* is always a hypermetron in the same rhythm as the *epithesis*, to which it stands related as an ἔκθεσις. Consequently the paroemiac or catalectic kolon is allowed only at the end. The only two seeming exceptions, Lys. 602 and Ran. 1088, have been mentioned. In some instances the number of kola in the *epistasis* and *antepistasis* is the same, and in one or two cases a slight change will produce this equality ; but the evidence, as a whole, is decidedly against any law either of correspondence or of eurhythmym.

The *epistasis* marks the end of the *epithesis* or attack. The assailant pauses as if to secure his position. We often find here a recapitulation, or at least a summing up of the merits of the principle advocated by the speaker, and sometimes the demerits of the opposed principle. The tone is usually more frivolous, and σκώμματα on the part of the antagonists are quite in order.

The *krisis* normally consists of four verses in the metre of the *antepithesis*. The number four has a far-reaching significance in tetrametric composition, as Zieliński has shown in his discussion of the other parts of the comedy.

The *krisis* and the *dialysis* I have combined under the common head *apallage*. This name, it need scarcely be said, relates

exclusively to the substance, not the form. It has already been seen that the *apallage* is rarely complete, and is sometimes wanting altogether. The circumstances controlling this feature were noted above; but there is a fact, connected with the total absence of a *krisis*, which deserves special attention, and which it seemed best not to touch upon until all the phenomena had been collected and examined. It is this: when the issue of an Agon is adverse to the principle which the poet approves, that is, when the comedy is of the Antigone type rather than the Elektra, there is no *krisis* at the end, but the Choros remains silent. The result is indicated clearly by the antagonists themselves, the vanquished either proclaiming his own defeat or else being driven from the stage. To determine whether this *is* a fact or not requires that we without prejudice decide which plays belong to the class mentioned. Fortunately this has been decided by a most competent judge, who is so far from being prejudiced that he says with regard to the chief Agon of the Clouds: "Wie stellt sich nun der Chor zu einem solchen Ausgange, der seinem Wunsche und der Forderung der Gerechtigkeit so wenig entspricht? Leider hat Aristophanes uns die Sphragis (= *krisis*), die wir mit Fug und Recht als Abschluss des Wortstreites erwarten dürfen, nicht hinzugedichtet." He ascribes the absence of a *krisis* at the end also of the secondary Agon of this play (which is of the same sort) to the incompleteness of the revision. In all this he seems to me to have gone slightly astray; but we can so much the more rely upon his opinion that in the Birds the poet is in sympathy with Peithetairos, and in Ploutos with Penia. The evidence in favor of my view can be felt in its full force only by those who will take the pains to recall or to examine all the Agons with special reference to this point. Even in Ekklesiazousai the Choros of women, fresh from the Pnyx, where they had put the great measure through, are not allowed to utter a word at the end of the Agon. When Praxagora has finished her *epistasis* she says to Blepyros and his friend (710), *φέρε νυν, φράσον μοι, ταῦτ' ἀρέσκει σφῶν*; They answer, *πάνν*. I look upon this trimeter as a part of the Agon, representing the *apallage*, that is, the *krisis* and *dialysis* combined.

The *dialysis*, as has been already stated, consists of a pair of triads composed in iambic trimeters and spoken each by one of the antagonists. In its full form it is still rarer than the *krisis*. Its occurrence is not frequent enough to justify any generalizations as to the conditions of its presence or absence. One fact may be

observed: the victor speaks the second triad; hence, when there has been no decision of the general contest by the Agon, as in *Lysistrata*, the speaker of the first triad, so far as the spectators are concerned, confesses himself as worsted in the conflict. The second triad seems to be modelled after the first, being a sort of modified echo of it.

The position of the Agon has been alluded to as being between the Parodos and the Parabasis. The exception in the case of the *Clouds* need not trouble us, as we do not know where the Agons or Parabasis would finally have been placed. The *ode* and *keleusma* of the original Agon are to be found before the new Parabasis. Cf. 457-477. The only real exceptions, then, are the *Frogs* and the *Knights*. In both these the contest runs entirely through the play, and in the case of the *Knights* one Agon does precede the Parabasis, thus: Parodos, secondary Agon, Parabasis, chief Agon, secondary Parabasis.

After the decline, or rather the abolition of the Choros, when the Parabasis disappeared, the syzygy of the Agon was reduced to a single *epicheiresis*. In the two extant Agons of this period the *probole* is anapaestic. It would not be safe to conclude from this that it was never iambic. The ὥραι of Aristophanes belonged to this period, and a long fragment (D. 476) of it, composed in iambic tetrameters, seems to belong to an *epithesis*. This modification of the Agon and omission of the Parabasis were accompanied by a change in the Parodos. The original elements were giving place to the new scenes: the old comedy was passing away.

In closing this article I wish to apologize for having said many things that must have been perfectly familiar to some of my readers. The reason for saying them, I hope, will be obvious. It was for the purpose of weaving them into a whole which is, or was, certainly not familiar to some who have written on Aristophanean subjects. It will not be out of place to give a few illustrations of this fact. They will show that it is not unreasonable to hope for some practical fruits from a recognition and study of the Agon. Westphal (*Metrik*, II, p. 421, note) remarks that a striking difference between the play of the *Clouds* and all the other comedies is, that it contains two Syntagmata (= Agons), while none of the rest contain more than one; whereas we have seen that the *Knights* contains two full Agons. In the Firmin-Didot text and in Green's school edition, not to mention others, the *keleusma* of the *Frogs*

(905 f.) is actually assigned to Dionysos—not, indeed, without the authority of nearly all the MSS. Even J. H. H. Schmidt, in his *Compositionslehre*, includes in the *ode* and *antode* the *keleusma* and *antikeleusma* in the secondary Agon of the Clouds and of the Knights. Teuffel, in his note on the chief Agon of the Clouds, remarks that possibly the final revision would have made the number of verses in the *epithesis* and *antepithesis* the same. No one will deny the possibility of this; but the remark shows that the author had not examined the corresponding phenomena of other plays. One of the most remarkable instances of disregard of the nature of an Agon is found in Arnoldt's *Chorpartien bei Aristophanes*. He attempts to establish "das Auftreten einzelner Choreuten," and distributes to the individual Choreutai their respective parts. In the Knights he begins with the Parodos and runs continuously on into the Agon in such a way that *the keleusma falls to the tenth Choreutes and the antikeleusma to the sixteenth*. This distribution is, indeed, only tentative, but it is at the same time utterly inconceivable to one who has any conception of the Agon. Examples might be greatly multiplied, but these are sufficient for the purpose.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.